



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/551,854

09/30/2005

Zenon Lysenko

63104A

6166

109 7590 11/24/2008

The Dow Chemical Company
Intellectual Property Section
P.O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

EXAMINER

CUTLIFF, YATE KAI RENE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/551,854	Applicant(s) LYSENKO ET AL.	
	Examiner YATE' K. CUTLIFF	Art Unit 1621	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) YATE' K. CUTLIFF. (3) Atty. Marie F. Zuckerman.

(2) ROSALYND KEYS. (4) Dr. David A. Babb.

Date of Interview: 12 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: Power point presentation of discussion points.

Claim(s) discussed: 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Frankel (US 3,787,459), Bahrmann et al. (CA 2,162,083) & Khoe et al. (journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants and Applicants' representative discussed the reasons they believed the prior art references did not provide motivation for the claimed alcohol composition. Further, there was discussion related to Declarations I and II. The discussion focused on the comparability of the data presented in both declarations. Applicants will present a declaration clarifying Declarations I and II with their response to the Office Action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/ROSALYND KEYS/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621	/YATE' K. CUTLIFF/ Examiner, Art Unit 1621
--	---